

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached drawing sheets include changes to Figures 1 and 2. These sheets replace the previously-filed drawing sheets including Figures 1 and 2. In Figures 1 and 2, text labels have been added to the boxes. No new matter has been added.

Attachments: Two (2) replacement sheets

REMARKS

I. Introduction

Claims 18 to 35 are pending in the present application. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable, and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Applicants note with appreciation the acknowledgment of the claim for foreign priority and the indication that all certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

Applicants thank the Examiner for considering the previously filed Information Disclosure Statement, PTO-1449 papers and cited references.

II. Claim 33

As an initial matter, the Examiner will note that claim 33 has been amended herein without prejudice to correct a typographic error to change "m address lines" to --m data lines--.

III. Allowable Subject Matter

As an initial matter, Applicants note with appreciation the indication of allowable subject matter included in claim 34. The Examiner will note that claim 34 has been rewritten herein in independent form to include all of the features of its base claim and any intervening claims. It is therefore respectfully submitted that claim 34 is in condition for immediate allowance.

IV. Objection to the Drawings

As regards the objection to the drawings, the Examiner will note that Figures 1 and 2 have been amended, without prejudice, to include text labels for the boxes. No new matter has been added. In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

V. Rejection of Claims 18 to 31 and 35 Under § 102(b)

Claims 18 to 31 and 35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0001540 ("Okamuro et

al.”). It is respectfully submitted that Okamuro et al. does not anticipate the present claims for at least the following reasons.

As an initial matter, the Examiner will note that certain amendments have been made to claims 18, 25 and 35. In this regard, claim 18 has been amended herein without prejudice to recite that a method includes transmitting measurement-data request instructions, transmitted from sequential electronics to a position-measurement device, without further time delay, to a signal-generating unit to immediately generate measurement data, by bypassing an internal interfacing unit. Claims 25 and 35 have been amended herein without prejudice in analogous manner. Support for these amendments may be found, for example, on page 2, line 31 to page 3, line 15 and page 9, lines 10 to 28 of the Specification. As stated in the Specification at page 2, lines 1 to 4, “[t]o ensure high control performance on the side of the sequential electronics, it is desirable to acquire measurement data, or more precisely, positional data, in a manner as free of delay as possible.”

In stark contrast to the foregoing, Okamuro et al. describe a position detection apparatus, in which a delay is required or provided between the reception of a request signal and the position measurement. In this regard, the Examiner’s attention is respectfully directed to paragraph [0054 and Figures 2 and 3. Thus, it is readily apparent that Okamuro et al. do not disclose, or even suggest, a method that includes transmitting measurement-data request instructions, transmitted from sequential electronics to a position-measurement device, without further time delay, to a signal-generating unit to immediately generate measurement data, by bypassing an internal interfacing unit.

It is “well settled that the burden of establishing a prima facie case of anticipation resides with the [United States] Patent and Trademark Office.” Ex parte Skinner, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1788, 1788 to 1789 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1986). To anticipate a claim, each and every element as set forth in the claim must be found in a single prior art reference. Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of Calif., 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Furthermore, “[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the . . . claim.” Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 U.S.P.Q.2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). That is, the prior art must describe the elements arranged as required by the claims. In re Bond, 910 F.2d 831, 15 U.S.P.Q.2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Since Okamuro et al. do not disclose, or even suggest, all of the features

included in amended claims 18, 25 and 35, it is respectfully submitted that Okamuro et al. do not anticipate these claims.

As for claims 19 to 24, which ultimately depend from claim 18, and 26 to 31 which ultimately depend from claim 25, it is respectfully submitted that Okamuro et al. do not anticipate these dependent claims for at least the same reasons more fully set forth above.

In view of all of the foregoing, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

VI. Rejection of Claims 32 and 33 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 32 and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of Okamuro et al. and "The Art of Electronics," page 495 ("Horowitz et al."). It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Okamuro et al. and Horowitz et al. does not render unpatentable the present claims for at least the following reasons.

Claims 32 and 33 ultimately depend from claim 25 and therefore include all of the features included in claim 25. As more fully set forth above, Okamuro et al. do not disclose, or even suggest, all of the features recited in claim 25. Horowitz et al. are not relied upon for disclosing or suggesting the features of claim 25 not disclosed or suggested by Okamuro et al. Indeed, it is respectfully submitted that Horowitz et al. do not disclose, or even suggest, the features of claim 25 not disclosed or suggested by Okamuro et al. As such, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Okamuro et al. and Horowitz et al. does not render unpatentable claims 32 and 33, which ultimately depend from claim 25.

In view of all of the foregoing, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

VII. Conclusion

It is therefore respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable. All issues raised by the Examiner having been addressed, an early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Sept. 21, 2006

By: 

Clifford A. Ulrich
Reg. No. 42,194

KENYON & KENYON LLP
One Broadway
New York, New York 10004
(212) 425-7200
CUSTOMER NO. 26646